REMARKS

The present amendment is in response to the Office Action dated October 11, 2007. Claims 1-7, 9-14, 36-49, and 85 are now present in this case. Claims 1, 36, 40, 46 and 85 are amended. Claim 84 is canceled. No new claims have been added.

The Examiner will kindly note that representation in this matter has been transferred to another attorney. A revocation/substitute power of attorney will be filed in the near future.

Several amendments were made to Claims 1, 36, 46 and 85 to distinguish between two types of "services" disclosed in the instant application: platform services and application services. Platform services include various interfaces (protocols) such as GSM, EDGE, GPRS, and UMTS. (Application, page 15, lines 17-26; page 4, line 26 – page 5, line 1-5.) Application services include various types of services specific to certain applications such as conventional voice service, voice over IP service, e-mail service, and streaming video service. (Application, page 9, lines 9-14.) The instant application makes clear that the application type of services are separate from, and carried over, the platform type of services. (Application, page 11, lines 15-17). Furthermore, the instant application discloses that a "carrier" may offer multiple platform services or "platforms." (Application, page 5, lines 1-5.) The instant application equates "platforms" with "networks." (Application, page 15, lines 17-26.)

Additional support for amendments to Claims 1, 36, 46 and 85 can be found in the instant application Page 16, line 24 – Page 18, line 3.

Claims 1-7, 36-39, and 42-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable by U.S. Patent No. 6,591,103 to Dunn combined with U.S. Patent No. 5,761,621 to Sainton. The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration.

Claim 1, as amended, contains at least one element not taught or suggested by the cited art, specifically:

"if one of the plurality of wireless networks can provide the requested application service within predetermined parameters for that application service, based on the quality of service parameters associated with the one of the plurality of wireless networks, choosing the one of the plurality of wireless networks to provide the application service."

Dunn discloses several systems and methods to provide selection of a carrier for a wireless user device where the carriers operate overlapping heterogeneous networks. (Dunn, Column 2, line 64 – Column 3, line 8.) These heterogeneous networks differ by frequency and protocol. (*Id.*) Dunn does not contemplate that a particular carrier may operate multiple networks in common geographic area, each network providing a different platform of service. Thus for Dunn, carrier selection is the equivalent of network selection. Dunn teaches a user device selecting a carrier based on carrier information that includes network availability, location and price. (Column 6, Lines 26-42; Column 8, Lines 36-60.) However, Dunn does not disclose that this carrier information is specific to an application service. That is, Dunn does not teach or suggest "if one of the plurality of wireless networks can provide the requested application service within predetermined parameters for that application service, based on the quality of service parameters associated with the one of the plurality of wireless networks, choosing the one of the plurality of wireless networks to provide the application service, as recited in Claim 1." Thus, Dunn does not disclose at least one element of Claim 1.

Sainton does not cure this deficiency. Sainton discloses a "radio communication circuit" configured to transfer information over different radio networks, wherein the circuit is configured to select a network based on selection criteria. (Sainton, Column 19, lines 12-25.) However, Sainton does not disclose that this selection criteria is specific to an application service. That is, Sainton does not teach or suggest "if one of the plurality of wireless networks can provide the requested application service within predetermined parameters for that application service, based on the quality of service parameters associated with the one of the plurality of wireless networks, choosing the one of the plurality of wireless networks to provide the

application service." Sainton discloses determining whether voice or data service is desired, then obtaining pricing only for networks that supply the desired type of service. (*Id.*) However, no matter which type of service is desired, the same user criteria is applied to select a network. (*Id.*) Thus Sainton does not disclose at least one element of Claim 1. For at least these reasons, the applicant believes this rejection of Claim 1 has been overcome.

Regarding Claims 2-6, they are dependent on amended Claim 1 and therefore incorporates all elements of Claim 1. The applicants believe that these rejections of Claims 2-6 are overcome for at least the same reasons as the applicants gave above regarding the rejection of amended Claim 1.

Claim 36, as amended, contains at least one element not taught or suggested by the cited art, specifically:

"directing the selection of one of the plurality of wireless networks based at least in part on whether the one of the plurality of wireless networks can provide the requested application service within predetermined parameters for that application service, based on the quality of service parameters associated with the one of the plurality of wireless networks."

As discussed above regarding Claim 1, Dunn teaches a user device selecting a carrier based on carrier information that includes network availability, location and price. However, Dunn does not teach or suggest "directing the selection of one of the plurality of wireless networks based at least in part on whether the one of the plurality of wireless networks can provide the requested application service within predetermined parameters for that application service, based on the quality of service parameters associated with the one of the plurality of wireless networks, as recited in Claim 36." As argued above regarding Claim 1, Sainton discloses a "radio communication circuit" configured to transfer information over different radio networks, wherein the circuit is configured to select a network based on selection criteria. However, Sainton does not teach or suggest "directing the selection of one of the plurality of wireless networks based at least in part on whether the one of the plurality of wireless networks can provide the requested application service within predetermined

parameters for that application service, based on the quality of service parameters associated with the one of the plurality of wireless networks."

For at least these reasons, the applicant believes this rejection of Claim 36 has been overcome.

Regarding Claims 37-39 and 42, they are dependent on amended Claim 36 and therefore incorporates all elements of Claim 36. The applicants believe that these rejections of Claims 37-39 and 42 are overcome for at least the same reasons as the applicants gave above regarding the rejection of amended Claim 36.

Claim 43, as amended, contains at least one element not taught or suggested by the cited art, specifically:

"if the current wireless network cannot support the application service requested within a predetermined parameter associated with the requested application service, choosing a different one of the plurality of wireless network to provide the requested application service , the chosen wireless network supporting the application service requested from the wireless device within the predetermined parameter."

As discussed above regarding Claim 1, Dunn teaches a user device selecting a carrier based on carrier information that includes network availability, location and price. However, Dunn does not teach or suggest "if the current wireless network cannot support the application service requested within a predetermined parameter associated with the requested application service, choosing a different one of the plurality of wireless network to provide the requested application service , the chosen wireless network supporting the application service requested from the wireless device within the predetermined parameter." As discussed above regarding Claim 1, Sainton discloses a "radio communication circuit" configured to transfer information over different radio networks, wherein the circuit is configured to select a network based on selection criteria. However, Sainton does not teach or suggest "if the current wireless network cannot support the application service requested within a predetermined parameter associated with the requested application service, choosing a different one of the plurality of wireless network to provide the requested application service , the

chosen wireless network supporting the application service requested from the wireless device within the predetermined parameter."

For at least these reasons, the applicant believes this rejection of Claim 43 has been overcome.

Claims 9-14, 40-41, 44-49, and 84-85 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable by Dunn et al., combined with Sainton, and U.S. Patent No. 6,159.625 to Zicker. The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration.

Regarding Claims 9-14, they are dependent on Claim 1. The Office Action finds the combination of Dunn and Sainton teaches the elements these claims incorporate from Claim 1 and finds Zicker teaches the additional claim element of periodic downloading of the table.

As discussed above regarding Claim 1, Dunn does not teach or suggest all elements of Claim 1, specifically:

"if one of the plurality of wireless networks can provide the requested application service within predetermined parameters for that application service, based on the quality of service parameters associated with the one of the plurality of wireless networks, choosing the one of the plurality of wireless networks to provide the application service."

As argued above regarding Claim 1, Dunn teaches a user device selecting a carrier based on carrier information that includes network availability, location and price. However, Dunn does not teach or suggest "if one of the plurality of wireless networks can provide the requested application service within predetermined parameters for that application service, based on the quality of service parameters associated with the one of the plurality of wireless networks, choosing the one of the plurality of wireless networks to provide the application service." As discussed above regarding Claim 1, Sainton discloses a "radio communication circuit" configured to transfer information over different radio networks, wherein the circuit is configured to select a network based on selection criteria. However, Sainton does not teach or suggest "if one of the plurality of wireless networks can provide the requested

application service within predetermined parameters for that application service, based on the quality of service parameters associated with the one of the plurality of wireless networks, choosing the one of the plurality of wireless networks to provide the application service."

Zicker does not cure this deficiency. Zicker discloses a cell phone that has a list of approved networks. (Zicker, Abstract.) However, Zicker does not teach or suggest that this list of approved networks is specific to an application service. Thus Zicker does not disclose or suggest "if one of the plurality of wireless networks can provide the requested application service within predetermined parameters for that application service, based on the quality of service parameters associated with the one of the plurality of wireless networks, choosing the one of the plurality of wireless networks to provide the application service."

For at least these reasons, the applicant believes the rejections of Claims 9-14 have been overcome.

Regarding Claims 40-41 they are dependent on amended Claim 36 and therefore incorporates all elements of Claim 36. The Office Action does not point only any part of Claims 40-41 that are taught or suggested by Zicker. Thus the applicant believes that these rejections of Claims 40-41 are overcome for at least the same reasons as the applicants gave above regarding the rejection of amended Claim 36.

Regarding Claims 44-49 they are dependent on amended Claim 43 and therefore incorporates all elements of Claim 43. The Office Action does not point only any part of Claims 44-49 that are taught or suggested by Zicker. Thus the applicant believes that these rejections of Claims 44-49 are overcome for at least the same reasons as the applicants gave above regarding the rejection of amended Claim 43.

Claim 84 has been canceled.

Claim 85, as amended, contains at least one element not taught or suggested by the cited art, specifically:

"determining by the home network whether the different network could provide the requested application service according to predetermined parameters

specific to the requested application service and quality of service parameters specific to the different network;"

As discussed above regarding Claim 1, Dunn teaches a user device selecting a carrier based on carrier information that includes network availability, location and price. However, Dunn does not teach or suggest "determining by the home network whether the different network could provide the requested application service according to predetermined parameters specific to the requested application service and quality of service parameters specific to the different network." As discussed above regarding Claim 1, Sainton discloses a "radio communication circuit" configured to transfer information over different radio networks, wherein the circuit is configured to select a network based on selection criteria. However, Sainton does not teach or suggest "determining by the home network whether the different network could provide the requested application service according to predetermined parameters specific to the requested application service and quality of service parameters specific to the different network." As discussed above regarding Claims 9-14, Zicker discloses a cell phone that has a list of approved networks. However, Zicker does not teach or suggest that this list of approved networks is specific to an application service. Thus Zicker does not disclose or suggest "determining by the home network whether the different network could provide the requested application service according to predetermined parameters specific to the requested application service and quality of service parameters specific to the different network." For at least these reasons, the applicant believes this rejection of Claim 85 has been overcome.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the subject application and its allowance are kindly requested. The applicant has made a good faith effort to place all claims in condition for allowance. If questions remain regarding the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (206) 757-8203.

Respectfully submitted,

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP

/Philip R. Hunt, Reg. # 58,044/

Philip R. Hunt

PRH:mn

1201 Third Avenue
Suite 2200
Seattle, Washington 98101
Phone: (206) 757-8203
Fax: (206) 757-7203
2157815_1.DOC